In: J. Smyth (ed) (1995) Critical Discourses on Teacher Development. London: Cassell.

Chapter 8

From Critical Education to a Critical Practice of Teaching

Ronald G. Sultana

INTRODUCTION

As a teacher educator and a sociologist of education, I have been struggling for some years now to bring the insights developed by the latter field to bear on my work within universities and on that of my students, teachers-to-be.[1] This has not been an easy task for a number of inter-related reasons.

In the first place, the brand of sociology and educational theory which inspires much of my work, namely critical theory,[2] is notorious for the level of abstraction at which it works, and the often convoluted and obscure language in which it is expressed. Student-teachers trying to make connections between theory and practice find many of the readings available on the subject hard to understand, let alone to apply to the challenging situations they encounter in the classrooms.

In the second place, critical theory and education often address a meta-physical level in their insistence on the emancipatory potential of engaging with the world as it *is*, in order to imagine and bring about a world as it *could* and *should* be. The normative dimension to the task of teaching is of course crucial if one is to challenge the increasingly technocratic view that is being promoted for schooling world-wide. It does, however, raise important questions such as 'Are schools the best places to promote emancipatory rationality?' and, even more centrally in terms of the concerns of this book, 'Can teachers be expected to participate in this emancipatory venture, given their social class location and the constraints of the cultural terrain in which they must carry out their work?' In other words, how can a teacher-educator ask student-teachers to consider schools as sites for liberation, when changes in the social and bureaucratic status quo may ultimately work against the interests of this particular group of professionals?

In the third place, much that has emerged from the critical theory tradition has appealed to the individual level of consciousness-raising, and hence depends on the notion of 'conversion' to points of views which, while leading to a disposition to act truly and rightly (*phronesis*), nevertheless are short on a consideration of strategies for the mobilization of resources and people so that the

desired state of affairs does in fact come about. Quite a number of students following my courses on critical education are seduced by the invitation to become reflective practitioners with a commitment to promoting justice and equality, but even the most dedicated among them are culturally, if not ideologically, incorporated in the centralized, exam-oriented bureaucratic school system that is to be found in Malta[3] as in many other countries. The heightened consciousness that critical teachers have of their role in the perpetration of symbolic violence in schools can in fact lead to an even deeper sense of frustration and despair, rather than to the transformation of people, situations and structures.

This paper will give a brief overview of the curricular, theoretical and political ways in which I have attempted to tackle the three challenges posed by critical theory to teacher educators as outlined above. In other words, the question this article will address – though, of course, not fully answer – is the following: How can critical education be taught in such a way that it is understandable, theoretically and practically appealing, and politically effective?

A. CRITICAL THEORY IS DIFFICULT

Introduction

Critical theory is difficult to read and to understand, as anybody who has tried to grapple with authors from the Frankfurt School will well appreciate. Indeed, perseverance in the decoding of that corpus of literature is only justified by the fact that critical theory has articulated with more thoroughness than any of the current critical traditions the two themes, of anti-technocratic rationality and of enlightenment, that are so crucial to the development of teacher education.[4] There have been attempts by critical educators to translate key concepts and ideas to a more accessible language, with some of these being more successful than others.[5–7] Students on teacher-training courses will not generally appreciate having to deal with texts whose theoretical sophistication does not immediately engage with real problems and issues, and where words like 'praxis', 'negative dialectics', 'ideology critique', 'reification' and 'repressive tolerance' assume an understanding of advanced philosophical and sociological knowledge.

This is not a case of replacing difficult words with simpler ones, and critical theorists themselves have rightly warned against a 'common language' approach, where the use of everyday terminology positions the reader within the ideological field that those words normally imply. I would much rather use words like 'social formation' than 'society', for instance, to emphasize the constructed and contingent nature of the social and systems relationships which predominate at a given moment. But there are other pedagogically sound ways of communicating challenging ideas which handle the theoretical/abstract level while at the

same time engaging with practical instances on which that theory can be brought to bear.

The use of case-studies

One of these is the use of case-study material, where students are requested to bring to courses on critical education journal entries and descriptions of critical incidents encountered during their teaching practice placements. By looking at this material critically, and by interrogating them on their situations and activities as well as those of their students, utilizing tools and concepts provided by critical theory (and by other traditions), teachers can appreciate better the unavoidable linkage between what one does and what one thinks, and vice versa. The use of such case-studies indicates an important shift in the way that teacher training is being conceived, away from a view which encourages 'the study of academic disciplines the results of which one must then learn to apply in practice, to seeing it as the mastery of the practices pursued in a progressively more reflective and critical way'.[8]

Thus, to give an example, the practice of inter- and intra-school streaming in the Maltese educational system is confronted situationally and theoretically in terms of the vested interests that underly it, the larger purposes it serves, the presumed educational benefits accruing from it, and so on. The Habermasian distinction between knowledge and its constitutive interests, in terms of technocratic, hermeneutic and emancipatory rationalities, then arises from the situation that (Maltese) teachers are familiar with. Similarly, a case-study of student and teacher confrontation not only raises inter-personal issues but also questions regarding power, authority and student voice. Again, the procedural principles which Habermas outlines as characteristic of the 'ideal speech situation' – truthfulness, meaningfulness, justifiability and sincerity – help students to study an incident as a problem, in terms of not only its psychological but also its structural and systemic properties.

The 'catechism'

Another tool I have developed to help students understand the implications of critical theory to their practice in schools and classrooms is based on a sixteenth-century pedagogical invention – the 'catechism'. This tool – considered by some to be the masterstroke of the Reformation, and probably the most influential pedagogic tool published by any reformer[9] – was developed by Luther in his desire to democratize theological knowledge. The catechism's method is to pinpoint specific areas considered worthy of attention and, by studying as a problem that which had hitherto been assumed to be reality, take the reader-practitioner to a plane which transcends the here and now. In this way the reader can make the link between abstract knowledge and its significance for everyday

life. Building on what is, given Malta's overwhelming Christian population, a culturally appropriate tool, I developed a series of questions organized around issues related to 'preparation', 'relationships', 'pedagogy', 'control' and 'assessment', thus helping the student-teacher to focus on concerns which have developed within critical education approaches. In this way, student-teachers are encouraged to engage not only with 'what works' but also with the normative dilemmas in which their actions and decisions are embedded.[10]

This pedagogic tool has been published elsewhere,[11] but for the purpose of this paper it would be useful to outline a few questions from just one of the areas it addresses, namely what I refer to as 'relationships'. Student-teachers on teaching practice are asked to study what they are doing as a problem, by using the following questions:

1. Do you deserve the respect you are expecting from your students? In other words, are you respecting them and their rights as much as you would like them to do with regard to you?
2. Should you be open to learning from your own students? In that case, as a 'teacher-student' you enter into a horizontal (equal/dialogic) as opposed to a vertical (hierarchical/ authoritarian) relationship with your 'student-teachers'. Are you aware of the implications of this to your teaching? To your pedagogy?
3. According to Friere, there must be six attitudes in a 'teacher-student' for dialogue to occur. How many of the following characterize what happens between you and your students?
   (a) *Love*: 'Dialogue cannot exist . . . in the absence of a profound love for the world and for human beings.'
   (b) *Humility*: 'Dialogue . . . is broken if I always project ignorance on to others and never perceive my own.'
   (c) *Faith*: 'Dialogue requires an intense faith in people, faith in their power to make and remake, to create and recreate, faith in their vocation to be more fully human.'
   (d) *Trust*: 'Mutual trust between the dialoguers is a logical consequence' of true dialogue.
   (e) *Hope*: 'Dialogue cannot be carried on in a climate of hopelessness. If the dialoguers expect nothing to come of their effort, their encounter will be empty, sterile, bureaucratic and tedious.'
   (f) *Critical thinking*: 'True dialogue cannot exist unless the dialoguers engage in critical thinking. The important thing is the continuing transformation of reality on behalf of the continuing humanization of people.'

B. CRITICAL THEORY AND TEACHERS

Problems of Communication

Communicating the concerns of critical theory and education in a way that is accessible to student-teachers is just one of the challenges that have to be faced in my attempt to reconstruct education as a moral and transformative enterprise. A second challenge refers not to the status of the message but to that of the group to whom it is addressed.

I have often asked myself, as I face a fresh group of students every year for my course on critical theory and education, what the chances are that they will find the course a meaningful, personally liberating and politically enlightening experience. In other words, what chance is there that my course promotes the formation of critical and autonomous educators, dedicated to the pursuit of justice in schools and other social sites?

The answer to that question necessarily goes beyond the interrogation of my abilities as a teacher. One needs also to ask whether there are structural and cultural factors which make teachers likely or unlikely candidates for transformative work in schools and classrooms. Recent sociological perspectives on teachers as a professional group have in fact tended to emphasize the limits rather than the possibilities of such an endeavour.

It has been pointed out, for instance, that teachers tend to be overwhelmingly from a middle-class background,[12,13] and that their contradictory class position in a stratified society means that they generally have little vested interest in promoting change to the status quo. In addition, when teachers enter the cultural site that is the school they find themselves locked in a pre-set structure with its routines, rituals and expectations which prove inordinately difficult to challenge. Among these constraints one can mention class size, school timetables, the education of persons who have not necessarily chosen to be at school, a hidden pedagogy, a concern with what works, and the organization of the school which means that when the teacher exercises autonomy, he or she does so within the conditions set by the institutional structure.[14]

Reflecting on such structural and cultural obstacles to the kinds of educational enterprises that have participatory democracy and the development of an active citizenry as a goal, one can hardly fault Burbules's conclusion that the relatively few teachers who do not develop in an overwhelming conservative and individualistic direction are 'more likely to quit than to remain and change the system'.[15] Moreover, as Everhart soberly points out[16], it seems to be quite unrealistic to ask teachers to challenge technocratic forms of life in schools, since more power-sharing with students will ultimately seriously challenge teachers' own roles as members of a bureaucracy.

These are important reflections which should encourage teacher educators to develop accurate bearings on the social situations of teachers and the constraints under which they work. They should not, however, lead to a counter-

productive pessimism about the contribution that schools and educators can make, for in trying to draw teachers into the general struggle for more democratic forms of life we are also drawing on a group

> [whose] educational thought is still deeply influenced by classical and liberal traditions of the formation and development of the whole person . . . . These traditions enshrined notions of autonomy and of the responsibility of individuals for 'taking their rights' – at least morally and intellectually – rather than receiving them.[17]

It is true that teachers are embedded – for structural and cultural reasons – in a 'culture of individualism',[18] and that this focus often makes them blind to the social and systemic properties of their activities in schools. The same focus, however, also generates a commitment to their clients, manifesting itself in what are often unselfconscious child-centred educational experiments and approaches which keep alive 'an intuitive idea of critique, of the possibility of transcendence'.[19] Liberalism and humanism may have their limits in their inability to link the personal with the political, but they are certainly a much more suitable ground for studying the problems of everyday life than is technocracy.

A crisis situation

There remains at least one major problem in attempting to answer the question of whether teachers and schools do, in fact, represent a potential means for the organization of enlightenment. Even if we admit that there is this potential, we also have to admit that the current historical conjuncture has rendered educators vulnerable, greatly weakened as they are by one of the most severe attacks that their profession has had to endure. A growing trend towards centralized control; a greater emphasis on vocationalism and instrumentalism; the move towards treating education as a commodity; enhanced links between the corporate sector and schooling institutions, and increased de-skilling of the teaching force[20] are hardly the appropriate environment for making professional demands on teachers which require a response of heroic proportions if they are to transcend narrow and largely material concerns in order to commit themselves to the redefinition of education as a moral and liberatory activity. Crises and increasing proletarianization tend to lead to crisis-management strategies such as 'coping' and 'withdrawing'.[21,22] And yet crises carry with them another and more promising alternative, for they generate the material conditions that make mobilization and the organization of counter-offensives possible – and this not only in terms of *industrial* action in favour of better salaries and/or conditions of work but also in terms of a truly *professional* action, where teachers engage in educational and other social movements to struggle for a different form of life.

This situation of crisis, I would argue, has led many teacher educators to develop a sense of a political mission in their approach to teacher training. However, most of what is being promoted seems to me to suffer from the same

weakness: a generally a-social, fragmented view of teachers' work. What we find are calls for progressive teachers to undertake 'the political and pedagogical strategies necessary to encourage oppositional behaviour in schools',[23] or to develop individual and/or group resistance within schools towards structural constraints and towards the hegemonic culture that dominates curriculum and pedagogy.[24] In the United Kingdom these kinds of resistances have been co-ordinated under the name of 'action research' which, in its best moments, helps reveal to teachers

> [the] transient and contingent status of their practice in a way which makes it amenable to critical transformation . . . it is [concerned] with establishing the conditions which would enable teachers to reflect critically on the contradictions between their educational ideas and beliefs and the institutionalized practices through which these ideas and beliefs are expressed.[25]

In Northern America we again find 'consciousness-raising' types of activity, whether these are addressed to experienced teachers[26] to university students,[27] or to would-be teachers on college programmes. All have the intention of helping their audiences to generate and sustain 'critical perspectives on schooling and teachers' commitments to work against the grain inside schools'.[28]

Both 'action research' and what Cochran-Smith refers to as 'collaborative resonance' (i.e. 'intensification based on the co-labor of learning communities'[29]) are an advance on previous models for promoting change, for they are neither blinkered by a sole focus on the individual to the exclusion of the social[30] nor turning a deaf ear to perspectives developed by teachers, which previously were considered to be unenlightened and unimportant.

But the exclusive focus on the local, and the fragmentary approach which does its best to utilize 'spaces' created by the predominant political forces of the time, have grave political and strategic implications, and are defensive and weak for at least two reasons. In the first place, opponents utilizing these 'micro' strategies are drawing on the ideological and political grounds provided by the wider institutional framework. In the second place, 'micro' responses which involve 'working from within' can often ironically mean 'individualized responses: the very ideology [of individualism] that is embodied in Thatcherism and that socialist educators should be challenging'.[31]

Gone, in teacher development discourse, are the political strategies on the Gramscian scale, for instance, or the militancy that Castillo del Torres reports in the context of revolutionary Grenada[32], and that the likes of Wolpe and Donald promoted when they advocated the forging of alliances between educators and parents, teachers and students.[33] There have been few organized and co-ordinated responses as a reaction to the increasingly technicized views of education. There have been spates of critiques by academics, but rarely have

these been translated into the effective movements that, for instance, have characterized the campaign against racism in education. Indeed, despite the obvious importance of social movements to what we do in education[34–36], the sociology of education tradition that has developed over the past three decades has failed to connect 'theory, research and practice . . . to historical movements in society and education'.[37] If anything, the language of critique that has characterized most educational theory thus far has, according to Wexler, blocked rather than facilitated educational social movements.

C. CRITICAL THEORY, MACRO RESPONSES AND TRANSFORMATION

Introduction

My way of handling the political passage from critical education to a critical practice of teaching has been to invite students following my courses to examine the relationship between challenges emerging in specific educational contexts and the larger, national battles over the definition of education. What follows is an account of how that invitation took organizational shape and became an educational movement in Malta.

The move from specific to more national and global issues in education emerged when, in the process of dialogue with and between students, the concept of 'responsible critique' demanded the development of alternative educational visions. Students recognized that it was important to carry out a sophisticated analysis of the bureaucratized and destructive social relations that prevailed in Maltese schools, of the gender and class distinctions encouraged by systems of selection and control, and of the relationship between this and a segmented labour market. They also correctly insisted, however, that their understanding of critical theory was an engagement with the world in order to *transform* it. The formation of critical teachers entailed the development of responsible citizens active in the public sphere. The key question was, therefore, how to bring together reflective minds and intentional hearts[38] so that a passion for justice could assume an organizational form.

The first activities were organized on an *ad hoc*, largely experimental basis. A group of students, many of whom had already been involved in other forms of grass-root pressure groups in green and alternative politics as well as in other movements within the Catholic Church, used the experience of their five- to six-week teaching practice to organize themselves into a critical nucleus which challenged the school's physical environment and resources, as well as the hierarchical social relations between teachers and students. Their action attracted media coverage and some changes were actually implemented in that school. The students were encouraged to report their activity during the critical education course, as a concrete example of the ability of individual social actors

to make their own history through collective will formation. The next step was to adapt that model and extend it to a wider grass-root base. A core group of student-teachers, lecturers and experienced teachers began meeting, established general goals, and chose the name *Moviment Edukazzjoni Umana*[39] to reflect their key intentions. The MEU would create a forum for teachers to discuss education in Malta from a normative point of view; it would serve as a support group for those teachers who did not wish to become incorporated by the utilitarian and technocratic, examination and achievement-centred ideology of schooling in Malta; it would encourage the setting up of grass-root critical/practical nucleii in school communities where teachers, together with students, would identify specific issues related to normative concerns such as justice, equity and caring which needed to be addressed, and develop a programme of intervention and change; it would co-ordinate these school-based projects, with each nucleus reporting to all MEU members at their monthly meeting in order to serve as a model for other teachers and to get feedback, and it would set up different action groups in favour of particular agendas.

While initially our action was ahead of our theory,[40] what we were in fact doing was what Touraine – a key author on social movement analysis – refers to in his 'sociology of action' as the intensification of conflict, the reinterpretation of social reality, and the redefinition of the self and its capacities. In contrast to the reproduction paradigm that has plagued social theory in education over the past three decades, Touraine follows the spirit of critical theory by highlighting the relative autonomy of actors, and defining the social field as a site where opponents fight over definitions and resources.[41] The interrelationship between protagonists, adversaries and the stakes – which gives rise to social movements – is a key and enduring characteristic of society, and lies 'permanently at the heart of social life . . . . These movements are not a sign of crisis or of tension in a social order; they are the outward sign of the production of society by itself'.[42]

Formal social movements are in fact the collective and organized expression of informal, but intensely personal, experiences and feelings generated in response to felt socio-cultural changes. Touraine holds the view that all contemporary social movements are in fact responding to a central concern, the desire of actors to win self-management in what is an increasingly technocratic society. Different social movements are in fact different fronts for the same battle, and constitute a major form of counter-hegemonic practice because they interpret very powerfully the attempts of 'society' to liberate itself from 'power'.[43] Touraine thus argues that in today's programmed society

> domination can no longer be challenged by a call to metasocial principles [e.g. order of things, divine rule, natural law, historical evolution, the idea of modernity]; only a direct call to personal and collective freedom and responsibility can foster protest movements.

Critical Education and the *Moviment Edukazzjoni Umana*

That direct call led to an expansion of the movement's membership base. Initially, recruitment took place from among the student body. The university provided a context and space, together with the rudiments of organization such as leaders and communication technology, and, through close collaboration with the Faculty of Education, it provided funds to advertise in the press, to send mail to members and to use venues for meetings. The large ecological concentrations of students whose ideological and ideational preparation was similar facilitated the recruitment of members, and the relative personal availability of students, in that they had few family commitments, made the initial task of getting the movement off the ground relatively easy. The fact that these students met other teachers during teaching practice, and that many were active in other organizations, meant that snowball recruitment was possible both with experienced members of the teaching profession and with parents. The MEU now has 200 members and, while young teachers make up the bulk, heads of schools, older and even retired teachers, as well as parents, attend the monthly meetings regularly.

The movement's actions are developed inside and outside state apparata. Nine school nucleii have developed within state schools thus far, and the focus of action for each of these has been different; one has worked on developing cross-curricular frameworks, another is trying to break down authoritarian management at school, while yet another has focused on establishing non-bureaucratic relations between teachers and students through setting up extra-curricular and cultural clubs. Action in state schools is, by definition, popular educational activity, as state schooling is practically the exclusive territory of students from working-class backgrounds. Action outside state apparata consists of monthly meetings where resolutions are taken in favour of specific agendas for action groups to work on. One action group has focused on family and school links in a working-class area in Malta. Forty couples attended a series of meetings on education, raised questions related to their children's needs, and ultimately channelled their anger and frustration into a political form by establishing a parental pressure group, independent of the movement, in order to work for getting more and better teaching resources for their village primary school, and for access to their children's teachers and classrooms.

A second action group took vocational schooling as its focus. It co-ordinated research efforts together with heads of trade schools in order to shift a discourse exclusively located within human capital theory to one which considered the educational and social implications of differential schooling in Malta. This has led to frequent meetings with trade school staff and administrators in preparation for a national conference which set out to make vocational (working-class) schooling an educational priority in Malta.

Another action group is developing skills in media and communications, hopes to produce its own newspaper on educational affairs and is planning television and radio programmes. Until these long-term goals are achieved, the

action group has drawn up a roster of writers who address educational issues in the local weekly and Sunday press. Linked to this action group is an alternative theatre group, which has already produced a challenging drama on social relations in the school. The group adapted its play for street theatre, and toured different locations in Malta. A key action group started out calling itself 'Student Voice', organized research activities with students to record their experiences of schooling, and co-ordinated a national exhibition which portrayed, through student writing and drawing, the school that these students would like. This action group has used that data to draw up a charter in favour of students' rights. The charter was launched, and heads of schools and prominent personalities (including ministers), as well as teachers, students and parents, were invited to sign it. Structures were set up at a national level to ensure that the rights were safeguarded. Through its recruitment and propaganda strategies, the movement has also tapped into projects that had been started on personal initiatives by other teachers prior to the formal setting-up of the MEU.

OUTCOMES AND CONCLUSION

The implications of the MEU case-study for the development of discourses about teacher education are clear. If schools are, as Archer has so forcefully argued,[44] sites where different groups attempt to establish their agendas, then surely a key task for teacher trainers is to provide a language of critique and the political skills – if not the organizational structure – by which and through which there can be a rational, moral and purposive collective commitment in the revisioning of education.

The MEU is a leader in that enterprise through the ways in which it dramatizes social issues, through changing the value positions of those it comes into contact with, and through pressuring for structural change. The MEU does all this when it creates a space for participants – in schools and at movement activities – where they can work against the hegemonic culture in which words like 'education', 'democracy' and 'citizenship' are steeped in a technocratic rationality which 'considers education primarily in instrumental terms and interprets democracy as a system of political management rather than a distinctive form of social and moral life'.[45] Teachers and others who come into contact with the MEU's activities develop a counter-hegemonic understanding of what their activities in schools and classrooms are about, and recognize the part they can play in bringing about change.

My task within this active form of teacher development is what Touraine refers to as 'sociological intervention',[46] which involves the raising of the consciousness of movement members so that we grasp the scope of the struggle more fully. I find myself interpreting, agitating, organizing, and working as analyst or secretary by reporting and explaining the results of self-analysis such as this. Ultimately, this is my way of translating critical knowledge into action, of

developing a transformative pedagogy in the specific historical conjuncture of Malta today, in order to avoid Touraine's damning accusation to us as intellectuals, when he argues that many of us

> are not self-consciously helping the blocked groups to mobilize their cultural resources for the purposes of collective self-realization . . . . We stand, fundamentally, in a relation of spectatorship to them, and not as committed interlocutors of this collectively evolving practice. We are not representing to the groups the nature of their struggles.[47]

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. I teach students following a four-year course leading to a B.Ed. (Hons) degree. Students have a number of compulsory and optional units in educational theory, together with courses in their main and subsidiary teaching subjects, and in pedagogy and methodology. I also teach critical theory at the postgraduate level, on one-year PGCE courses and two-year M.Ed. courses.

2. As developed by the various members of the Frankfurt School, 'critical theory' has three key agendas, namely the economic analysis of contemporary developments in capitalism, the social psychological investigation of the social integration of individuals, and the cultural-theoretical analysis of the mode of operation of mass culture (Honneth, A., 'Critical theory'. In Giddens, A. and Turner, J. (eds)., *Social Theory Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987.) Critical educators have directly or indirectly engaged with the tradition developed by the Frankfurt School to tease out the implications of this to schooling. Here education is considered to involve the critical interrogation of what passes as everyday, common-sense activity so that knowledge, social forms and practices become liberatory and empowering (see Sultana, R. G., 'The challenge of critical education', *McGill Journal of Education*, 26 (2), pp. 115–28, 1991a).

3. Malta's educational systems are characterized by strong classifications of the segments, with the state sector offering academic, area and vocational schooling to students with different educational (and social class) backgrounds. The private school sector caters for about 30 per cent of all students (see Sultana, R. G., 'Social class and educational achievement in Malta'. In Sultana, R. G. (ed.), *Themes in Education: A Maltese Reader*. Msida, Malta: Mireva, 1991).

4. This point is, of course, debatable. For a defence of the critical theory tradition, in the face of the onslaught of the politically fragmenting 'postmodernisms', see Habermas, J., *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987.

5. Simon, R. I., *Teaching Against the Grain*. Toronto: OISE Press, 1992.

6. Carr, W. and Kemmis, S., *Becoming Critical*. London: Falmer Press, 1988.

7. McLaren, P., *Life in Schools*. New York: Longman, 1989.

8. Hirst, P., 'Professional preparation and the study of educational situations'. In Sultana, R. G., (ed.), *Themes in Education: A Maltese Reader*. Msida, Malta: Mireva, p. xxi, 1991.

9. Bornkamm, H., *Luther in mid-Career 1521-1530*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, p. 60, 1985.

10. The catechism, of course, provided the answers to the questions posed. In the case of this pedagogical tool, and in the spirit of critical theory, the questions invite the reader to explore alternatives. This does not mean, of course, that there is no agenda in the selection of the items and practices which are studied as problems. The normative stance of the author is in fact made clear in the introductory section of the tool.

11. Sultana, R. G., 'Towards a critical teaching practice: notes for the teacher educator'. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 14 (1), pp. 14–30, 1990.

12. Steven, R., 'Towards a class analysis of New Zealand'. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 14 (2), pp. 113–29, 1978.

13. Harris, K., *Teachers and Classes*. Boston, MA and London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982.

14. Sachs, J. and Smith, R., 'Constructing teacher culture'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 9 (4), pp. 423–36, 1988.

15. Burbules, N. C., 'Education under siege'. *Educational Theory*, 36, pp. 301–13 (p. 302), 1985.

16. Everhart, R. B., *Reading, Writing and Resistance*. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.

17. Young, R. E., *A Critical Theory of Education: Habermas and Our Children's Future*. New York and London: Teachers College Press, p. 42, 1990.

18. Hargreaves, A., 'Experience counts, theory doesn't: how teachers talk about their work'. *Socioloy of Education*, 57 (4), pp. 244–54, 1984.

19. Young, op. cit., note 17.

20. Sharp, R., 'Old and new orthodoxies: the seduction of liberalism'. In Cole, M. (ed.), *Bowles and Gintis Revisisted*. London: Falmer, 1988.

21. Merton, R. K., *Social Theory and Social Structure*. New York: Free Press, 1968.

22. Woods, P. (ed.), *Teacher Strategies*. London: Croom Helm, 1980.

23. Burbules, op. cit., note 15.

24. Kanpol, B., 'The concept of resistance: further scrutiny'. *Critical Pedagogy Networker*, 2 (1), pp. 1–4, 1989.

25. Carr, W., 'Action research: ten years on'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, **21** (1), pp. 85–90 (p. 86), 1989.

26. Simon, op. cit., note 5.

27. Ellsworth, E., 'Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical education'. *Harvard Educational Review*, **59** (3), 1989.

28. Cochran-Smith, M., 'Learning to teach against the grain'. *Harvard Educational Review*, **61** (3), pp. 279–310, 1991.

29. Ibid., p. 282.

30. Dale, R., 'Implications of the rediscovery of the hidden curriculum for the sociology of teaching'. In Gleeson, D. (ed.), *Identity and Structure: Issues in the Sociology of Education*. Driffield, North Humberside: Nafferton Books, 1977.

31. Crozier, G., 'Progressive and democratic education: is there a future?' *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, **10** (2), pp. 263–9 (p. 266), 1989.

32. Torres, C., 'Education and democracy in revolutionary Grenada'. *Access*, **5** (1), pp. 1–43, 1986.

33. Wolpe, A. M. and Donald, J. (eds), *Is There Anyone Here From Education?* London: Pluto Press, 1983.

34. Carnoy, M. and Levin, H. M., *Schooling and Work in the Democratic State*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1985.

35. Sultana, R. G., 'Social movements and the transformation of teachers' work: case studies from New Zealand'. *Research Papers in Education*, **6** (2), pp. 133–52, 1991.

36. Sultana, R. G., 'Teacher power and the struggle for democracy: an educational movement in Malta'. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, **2** (1), pp. 3–22, 1992.

37. Wexler, P., *Social Analysis of Education: After the New Sociology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, p. 88, 1987.

38. Bell, L. and Schneidewind, N., 'Reflective minds/intentional hearts: joining humanistic education and critical theory for liberating education'. *Journal of Education*, **169** (2), pp. 55–77, 1987.

39. The word 'umana' should not translate into 'humanistic' but rather, in the Maltese language, carries connotative terms/phrases such as 'respect for the dignity and needs of the individual', 'child-centred', 'democratic' and 'participatory community', and is in opposition to a purely 'academic' form of schooling.

40. I have written a full account of the theoretical underpinnings of the activity of the MEU (see Sultana, op. cit., note 36).

41. Touraine, A., 'An introduction to the study of social movements'. *Social Research*, 4, pp. 749–87 (p. 750), 1985.

42. Touraine, A., 'The new social conflicts: crisis or transformation?' In Lemert, C. C. (ed.), *French Sociology: Rupture and Renewal since 1968*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 29, 31, 1981 (original French version 1977).

43. Touraine (1985), op. cit., note 41, p. 776.

44. Archer, Margaret A., *Social Origins of Educational Systems*. London: Sage, 1979.

45. Carr, op. cit., note 25, p. 36.

46. Touraine, A., *The Voice and the Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 191ff, 1981 (original French version 1981).

47. Ibid., p. 142.